

# QUASI-UNIFORMITY OF MINIMAL WEIGHTED ENERGY POINTS ON COMPACT METRIC SPACES

D. P. HARDIN, E. B. SAFF, AND J. T. WHITEHOUSE

ABSTRACT. For a closed subset  $K$  of a compact metric space  $A$  possessing an  $\alpha$ -regular measure  $\mu$  with  $\mu(K) > 0$ , we prove that whenever  $s > \alpha$ , any sequence of weighted minimal Riesz  $s$ -energy configurations  $\omega_N = \{x_{i,N}^{(s)}\}_{i=1}^N$  on  $K$  (for ‘nice’ weights) is quasi-uniform in the sense that the ratios of its mesh norm to separation distance remain bounded as  $N$  grows large. Furthermore, if  $K$  is an  $\alpha$ -rectifiable compact subset of Euclidean space ( $\alpha$  an integer) with positive and finite  $\alpha$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure, it is possible to generate such a quasi-uniform sequence of configurations that also has (as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ) a prescribed positive continuous limit distribution with respect to  $\alpha$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $A$  be a compact infinite metric space with metric  $d: A \times A \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and let  $\omega_N = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset A$  denote a configuration of  $N \geq 2$  points in  $A$ . We are chiefly concerned with two ‘quality’ measures of  $\omega_N$ ; namely, the *separation distance* of  $\omega_N$  defined by

$$(1.1) \quad \delta(\omega_N) := \min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq N} d(x_i, x_j),$$

and the *mesh norm* of  $\omega_N$  with respect to  $A$  defined by

$$(1.2) \quad \rho(\omega_N, A) := \max_{y \in A} \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} d(y, x_i).$$

This quantity is also known as the *fill radius* or *covering radius* of  $\omega_N$  relative to  $A$ . The optimal values of these quantities are also of interest and we consider, for  $N \geq 2$ , the  *$N$ -point best-packing distance on  $A$*  given by

$$\delta_N(A) := \max\{\delta(\omega_N) : \omega_N \subset A, |\omega_N| = N\},$$

and the  *$N$ -point mesh norm of  $A$*  given by

$$\rho_N(A) := \min\{\rho(\omega_N, A) : \omega_N \subset A, |\omega_N| = N\},$$

where  $|S|$  denotes the cardinality of set  $S$ .

In the theory of approximation and interpolation (for example, by splines or radial basis functions (RBFs)), the separation distance is often associated with some

---

*Date:* January 19, 2013.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 31C20, 65N50, 57N16; Secondary: 52A40, 28A78.

*Key words and phrases.* Fill radius, Mesh-separation ratio, Best-packing, Optimal configurations, Covering radius, Minimal Riesz energy, Quasi-uniformity, Separation distance.

The research of all authors was supported, in part, by the U. S. National Science Foundation under grants DMS-0808093 and DMS-1109266.

measure of ‘stability’ of the approximation, while the mesh norm arises in the error of the approximation. In this context, the *mesh-separation ratio* (or *mesh ratio*)

$$\gamma(\omega_N, A) := \rho(\omega_N, A) / \delta(\omega_N),$$

can be regarded as a ‘condition number’ for  $\omega_N$  relative to  $A$ . If  $\{\omega_N\}_{N=2}^\infty$  is a sequence of  $N$ -point configurations such that  $\gamma(\omega_N, A)$  is uniformly bounded in  $N$ , then the sequence is said to be *quasi-uniform on  $A$* . Quasi-uniform sequences of configurations are important for a number of methods involving RBF approximation and interpolation (see [9, 15, 17, 19]).

We remark that in some cases it is easy to obtain positive lower bounds for the mesh-separation ratio. For example, if  $A$  is connected, then  $\gamma(\omega_N, A) \geq 1/2$ . Furthermore, letting

$$B(x, r) = \{y \in A : m(y, x) \leq r\}$$

be the closed ball in  $A$  with center  $x$  and radius  $r$ , then  $\gamma(\omega_N, A) \geq \beta/2$  for any  $N$ -point configuration  $\omega_N \subset A$  whenever  $A$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  have the property that for any  $r \in (0, \text{diam}(A)]$  and any  $x \in A$ , the annulus  $B(x, r) \setminus B(x, \beta r)$  is nonempty. The diameter of  $A$  is defined by

$$\text{diam}(A) := \max\{m(x, y) : x \in A, y \in A\}.$$

In this paper we consider the separation distance and mesh norm of finite point configurations in  $A$  that minimize certain weighted energy functionals. We call  $w : A \times A \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  an *SLP weight on  $A$*  if it is symmetric and lower semi-continuous on  $A \times A$  and is positive on the diagonal,  $D(A)$ , of  $A \times A$ . For  $s > 0$  and a collection of  $N \geq 2$  distinct points  $\omega_N = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} \subset A$ , the  $(s, w)$ -energy of  $\omega_N$  (also known as the *weighted Riesz  $s$ -energy*) is

$$(1.3) \quad E_s^w(\omega_N) := \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{w(x_i, x_j)}{(x_i, x_j)^s} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N \frac{w(x_i, x_j)}{(x_i, x_j)^s},$$

and we denote the *minimal  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy of  $A$*  by

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{E}_s^w(N, A) := \inf\{E_s^w(\omega_N) : \omega_N \subset A, |\omega_N| = N\}.$$

Since  $A$  is compact and the energy  $E_s^w(\omega_N)$  is lower semi-continuous, there exists at least one  $N$ -point configuration  $\omega_N^* \subset A$  such that  $E_s^w(\omega_N^*) = \mathcal{E}_s^w(N, A)$ . We refer to such an  $\omega_N^*$  as an  *$N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configuration on  $A$* . The asymptotics as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  of  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configurations and their energies are investigated in [2, 10] for  $d$ -rectifiable sets  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $s > d$  (see further discussion in the next section).

In our results we shall require that  $A$  is either  $\alpha$ -regular or upper  $\alpha$ -regular as we next describe. For a positive Borel measure  $\mu$  supported on  $A$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , we say that  $\mu$  is *upper  $\alpha$ -regular* if there is some finite constant  $C_0$  such that

$$(1.5) \quad \mu(B(x, r)) \leq C_0 r^\alpha \quad (x \in A, 0 < r \leq \text{diam}(A)),$$

and we say that  $\mu$  is *lower  $\alpha$ -regular* if there is some positive constant  $c_0$  such that

$$(1.6) \quad c_0^{-1} r^\alpha \leq \mu(B(x, r)) \quad (x \in A, 0 < r \leq \text{diam}(A)).$$

We shall refer to  $A$  as an *upper  $\alpha$ -regular metric space* if there exists an upper  $\alpha$ -regular measure  $\bar{\mu}$  on  $A$  such that  $\bar{\mu}(A) > 0$  and shall refer to  $A$  as a *lower  $\alpha$ -regular*

*metric space* if there exists a lower  $\alpha$ -regular measure  $\underline{\mu}$  on  $A$  such that  $\underline{\mu}(A) < \infty$ . (Obviously, if  $A$  is upper  $\alpha$ -regular then  $A$  has infinitely many points.) If  $A$  supports a measure that is both upper and lower  $\alpha$ -regular, then we say that  $A$  is an  $\alpha$ -regular *metric space*. If  $A$  is  $\alpha$ -regular, then it is not difficult to show that the Hausdorff dimension of  $A$ ,  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}} A$ , equals  $\alpha$  (cf. [12, 16]). Furthermore, the  $\alpha$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of  $A$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(A)$ , is positive and finite.

Many of the constants appearing in this paper, either explicitly or implicitly involve the upper and lower regularity constants  $C_0$  and  $c_0$  appearing in (1.5) and (1.6). However, in certain cases we are interested in ‘local’ regularity estimates (i.e., for  $r$  small) which can substantially improve our explicit estimates for particular metric spaces of interest (e.g.,  $A$  is the sphere  $S^d$  with the Euclidean metric). Specifically, if  $\bar{\mu}$  is an upper  $\alpha$ -regular measure,  $\underline{\mu}$  is a lower  $\alpha$ -regular measure and  $r^* > 0$ , we define

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} C_0(r^*) &:= \sup\{\bar{\mu}(B(x, r))/r^\alpha : x \in A, 0 < r \leq r^*\}, \\ c_0(r^*)^{-1} &:= \inf\{\underline{\mu}(B(x, r))/r^\alpha : x \in A, 0 < r \leq r^*\}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that both  $C_0(r^*)$  and  $c_0(r^*)$  are increasing in  $r^*$ , and we make the definitions

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} C_0(0) &:= \lim_{r^* \rightarrow 0^+} C_0(r^*), \\ c_0(0) &:= \lim_{r^* \rightarrow 0^+} c_0(r^*). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if  $A$  is a compact (i.e., without boundary),  $C^1$ ,  $d$ -dimensional manifold and  $\mu = \mathcal{H}_d$ , then  $C_0(0) \cdot c_0(0) = 1$ . For the largest length scale of interest, with a slight abuse of notation, the global constants for  $\bar{\mu}$  and  $\underline{\mu}$ , respectively, are related by  $C_0 = C_0(\text{diam}(A))$  and  $c_0 = c_0(\text{diam}(A))$ .

One may obtain simple upper bounds for  $\delta_N(A)$  (respectively, lower bounds for  $\rho_N(A)$ ) in the case that  $A$  is lower (respectively, upper)  $\alpha$ -regular. Specifically, if  $A$  is lower  $\alpha$ -regular then there is a constant  $c_A < \infty$  such that

$$(1.9) \quad \delta_N(A) \leq c_A N^{-1/\alpha}, \quad (N \geq 2),$$

while if  $A$  is upper  $\alpha$ -regular then there is a constant  $\tilde{c}_A > 0$  such that

$$(1.10) \quad \rho_N(A) \geq \tilde{c}_A N^{-1/\alpha}, \quad (N \geq 2).$$

The bound (1.9) is a consequence of the facts that the balls  $\{B(x, \delta(\omega_N)/2) : x \in \omega_N\}$  are pairwise disjoint and that there exists a lower  $\alpha$ -regular measure  $\underline{\mu}$  with  $\underline{\mu}(A) < \infty$ . Similarly, if  $A$  is upper  $\alpha$ -regular, then the bound (1.10) follows from the covering property of the balls  $\{B(x, \rho(\omega_N, A)) : x \in \omega_N\}$  and the existence of an upper  $\alpha$ -regular measure  $\bar{\mu}$  with  $\bar{\mu}(A) > 0$ .

The main result of this paper, given in Theorem 5, is that a sequence of  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configurations on an  $\alpha$ -regular compact metric space  $A$  is quasi-uniform on  $A$  whenever  $s > \alpha$ . As an application, we deduce that, if  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  is  $d$ -rectifiable for some integer  $0 < d \leq p$  with  $\mathcal{H}_d(A) > 0$ , then a quasi-uniform sequence of  $N$ -point configurations on  $A$  can be found that has a prescribed bounded positive density on  $A$  (see Corollary 6 and the discussion preceding it).

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

We first consider the separation distance of  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configurations on an upper  $\alpha$ -regular compact metric space  $A$ . For these separation results, we consider symmetric weight functions  $w$  such that  $\|w(\cdot, x)\|_{L_p(\mu)}$  is uniformly bounded on  $A$  for some  $1 < p \leq \infty$ . Here we use the standard notation,

$$\|f\|_{L_p(\mu)} := \begin{cases} \left(\int_A |f|^p d\mu\right)^{1/p}, & 1 \leq p < \infty, \\ \mu\text{-ess sup } |f|, & p = \infty, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mu$  is a positive Borel measure and  $f$  is a Borel measurable function on  $A$ .

The following theorem extends a result [2, Theorem 4] to a more general class of weight functions and to more general compact metric spaces.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $A$  be a compact, upper  $\alpha$ -regular metric space with respect to  $\bar{\mu}$  and let  $w$  be an SLP weight on  $A$  such that  $\|w(\cdot, x)\|_{L_{p_0}(\bar{\mu})}$  is uniformly bounded on  $A$  for some  $1 < p_0 \leq \infty$ . Suppose  $1 < p \leq p_0$ ,  $s > \alpha(1 - 1/p)$ , and  $N \geq 2$ . If  $\omega_N^*$  is an  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configuration on  $A$ , then*

$$(2.1) \quad \delta(\omega_N^*) \geq C_1 N^{-\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{sp}\right)} \quad (N \geq 2),$$

where  $C_1$  is a constant independent of  $N$  indicated below in (3.13).

Taking  $w$  bounded and setting  $p = \infty$  in Theorem 1 produces the following result.

**Corollary 2.** *Suppose  $A$  is a compact, upper  $\alpha$ -regular metric space and  $w$  is a bounded SLP weight on  $A$ , and let  $s > \alpha$ . If  $\omega_N^*$  is an  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configuration on  $A$ , then*

$$(2.2) \quad \delta(\omega_N^*) \geq C_2 N^{-1/\alpha} \quad (N \geq 2),$$

where  $C_2$  is a constant independent of  $N$ . Consequently,

$$(2.3) \quad \delta_N(A) \geq C_2 N^{-1/\alpha} \quad (N \geq 2).$$

For the unweighted case  $w \equiv 1$ , the constant  $C_2$  satisfies

$$(2.4) \quad C_2 \geq \left[ \frac{\bar{\mu}(A)}{C_0} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{s}\right) \right]^{1/\alpha} \left(\frac{\alpha}{s}\right)^{1/s},$$

where  $C_0 = C_0(\text{diam}(A))$ .

We note that if  $A$  in Corollary 2 is  $\alpha$ -regular, then by inequality (1.9) we see that  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configurations on  $A$  have the best possible order of separation as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

With respect to the separation constant of (2.4), if  $d \geq 2$  and  $A = \mathbb{S}^d$  with  $\sigma_d$  denoting the uniform probability distribution on  $\mathbb{S}^d$ , then we can get an explicit lower bound for  $C_2$  by calculating the regularity constant  $C_0$ . As stated in [13], for  $x \in \mathbb{S}^d$ ,  $0 \leq r \leq 2$ , and

$$(2.5) \quad \gamma_d := \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{d+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma(d/2)\Gamma(1/2)},$$

there holds

$$\sigma_d(r) := \sigma_d(B(x, r)) = \gamma_d \int_{1-r^2/2}^1 (1-t^2)^{d/2-1} dt$$

from which it follows that

$$\sigma_d(r) \leq \frac{\gamma_d}{d} r^d,$$

and, as  $r \rightarrow 0^+$ ,

$$\sigma_d(r) = \frac{\gamma_d}{d} r^d + \mathcal{O}(r^{d+2}).$$

Therefore, for the uniform probability distribution on  $\mathbb{S}^d$ , the global upper regularity constant is

$$(2.6) \quad C_0 = \sup_{0 < r \leq 2} \frac{\sigma_d(r)}{r^d} = \frac{\gamma_d}{d},$$

and when applied to (2.4) we obtain

$$(2.7) \quad C_2 \geq \left(\frac{d}{\gamma_d}\right)^{1/d} \left(1 - \frac{d}{s}\right)^{1/d} \left(\frac{d}{s}\right)^{1/s}.$$

With this lower bound for  $C_2$ , (2.2) becomes

$$(2.8) \quad \delta(\omega_N^*) \geq \left(\frac{d}{\gamma_d}\right)^{1/d} \left(1 - \frac{d}{s}\right)^{1/d} \left(\frac{d}{s}\right)^{1/s} N^{-1/d} \quad (N \geq 2, s > d),$$

and, on letting  $s \rightarrow \infty$ , we deduce for the  $N$ -point best-packing distance

$$\delta_N(\mathbb{S}^d) \geq \left(\frac{d}{\gamma_d}\right)^{1/d} N^{-1/d} \quad (N \geq 2, s > d).$$

A less explicit lower bound for the separation constant of minimal energy points for  $s > d$  on  $\mathbb{S}^d$  was obtained in [13, Corollary 4].

We next consider the mesh norm of  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configurations on an  $\alpha$ -regular compact metric space  $A$ . In this case we require that the weight function  $w$  be bounded.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $A$  be a compact,  $\alpha$ -regular metric space with respect to the measure  $\mu$  and  $K \subset A$  be a compact set of positive  $\mu$ -measure. Let  $w$  be a bounded SLP weight on  $K$ . If  $s > \alpha$  and  $\omega_N^*$  is an  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configuration on  $K$ , then*

$$(2.9) \quad \rho(\omega_N^*, K) \leq C_3 N^{-1/\alpha} \quad (N \geq 2),$$

where  $C_3$  is a constant independent of  $N$  given below in (3.41).

Theorem 3 substantially extends a result of [6] that holds for unweighted energy minimizing point configurations when  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  is restricted to be the finite union of bi-Lipschitz images of compact sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

We remark that for  $K$  and  $A$  as in Theorem 3, the set  $K$  need not inherit the lower  $\alpha$ -regularity of  $A$ . However, since  $\mu(K) > 0$ , we do have that  $K$  is an upper  $\alpha$ -regular metric space and, consequently, there is a constant  $\tilde{c}_K > 0$  such that (1.10) holds with  $A$  replaced by  $K$ . Hence, the inequality (2.9) has the best possible order with respect to  $N$ .

Taking  $w \equiv 1$  in Theorem 3 immediately yields the following.

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $A$  be a compact,  $\alpha$ -regular metric space with respect to the measure  $\mu$  and let  $K \subset A$  be a compact set of positive  $\mu$ -measure. Then there exists a constant  $C_4$  such that*

$$\rho_N(K) \leq C_4 N^{-1/\alpha} \quad (N \geq 2).$$

Combining Corollary 2 and Theorem 3 we obtain our main result.

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $A$  be a compact,  $\alpha$ -regular metric space with respect to the measure  $\mu$  and let  $K \subset A$  be a compact set of positive  $\mu$ -measure. Furthermore, let  $w$  be a bounded SLP weight on  $K$ , and for  $s > \alpha$  and  $N \geq 2$ , let  $\omega_N^*$  be an  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configuration on  $K$ . Then  $\{\omega_N^*\}_{N=2}^\infty$  is quasi-uniform on  $K$ .*

We remark that there are  $\alpha$ -regular sets  $A$  and values of  $s < \alpha$  for which (unweighted)  $(s, 1)$ -energy minimizing configurations on  $A$  have a mesh-separation ratio that goes to  $\infty$  with  $N$ . One such example given in [4] is a ‘washer’  $A$  obtained by revolving a certain rectangle about an axis parallel to one of its sides, where it turns out that for  $s < 1/3$ , the support of the limit distribution of the  $(s, 1)$ -energy minimizing configurations on  $A$  omits an open subset of  $A$ . Also, for the logarithmic energy which corresponds to  $s = 0$ , it is shown in [11] that, for  $w \equiv 1$ , the support of the limit distribution of the log-energy minimizing configurations on a torus in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  is only supported on the positive curvature portion of the torus, so that the mesh-separation ratio for such configurations is again unbounded as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Examples also abound in one dimension. For the logarithmic energy, it is well-known [21, Sections 6.7 and 6.21] that for  $A = [-1, 1]$  and  $w \equiv 1$  the minimum energy points are zeros of Jacobi orthogonal polynomials (together with  $\pm 1$ ) that have separation distance of precise order  $1/N^2$  and mesh norm of precise order  $1/N$ , so that the mesh-separation ratio grows like  $N$ .

One of our main motivations for considering weighted minimum energy configurations is that for a large class of sets  $A$  one can design a weight function  $w$  so that a sequence of  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configurations have a specified limiting density on  $A$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . The following result is a consequence of Theorem 5 and [2, Corollary 2]. Recall that a set in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  is  $d$ -rectifiable if it is the Lipschitz image of a bounded set in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Corollary 6.** *Let  $d \leq p$  and  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  be a compact, infinite set that is  $d$ -rectifiable and lower  $d$ -regular with respect to  $\mathcal{H}_d$  for some integer  $d$ . Suppose  $\sigma$  is a probability density on  $A$  that is continuous almost everywhere with respect to  $\mathcal{H}_d$  and is bounded above and below by positive constants. Let  $s > d$  and  $w : A \times A \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be given by*

$$(2.10) \quad w(x, y) := (\sigma(x)\sigma(y))^{-s/2d}.$$

*For  $N \geq 2$ , let  $\omega_N^*$  be an  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configuration on  $A$ . Then  $\{\omega_N^*\}_{N=2}^\infty$  is quasi-uniform on  $A$  and the sequence of normalized counting measures associated with the  $\omega_N^*$ ’s converges weak-star (as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ) to  $\sigma d\mathcal{H}_d$ .*

For  $A$  an infinite, compact, metric space and  $s > 0$ , let  $\omega_N^s$  be an  $N$ -point  $(s, 1)$ -energy minimizing configuration on  $A$ . Furthermore, let  $\nu_N$  be a cluster point (in the product topology on  $A^N$ ) of  $\omega_N^s$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . As we now show,  $\nu_N$  must be an  $N$ -point best-packing configuration on  $A$ , that is,  $\delta(\nu_N) = \delta_N(A)$ . For this purpose, let  $\tilde{\omega}_N$  be an  $N$ -point best-packing configuration on  $A$ . Then we have

$$\delta(\omega_N^s)^{-s} \leq \mathcal{E}_s^1(N, A) \leq E_s^1(\tilde{\omega}_N) \leq N(N-1)\delta_N(A)^{-s},$$

and so

$$(N(N-1))^{-1/s}\delta_N(A) \leq \delta(\omega_N^s) \leq \delta_N(A),$$

which gives

$$(2.11) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \delta(\omega_N^s) = \delta_N(A).$$

Since  $\omega_N^{s_j} \rightarrow \nu_N$  for some subsequence  $s_j \rightarrow \infty$ , it follows from (2.11) and continuity that  $\delta(\nu_N) = \delta_N(A)$  and so  $\nu_N$  is an  $N$ -point best-packing configuration on  $A$ .

In general, it is not true that a sequence of  $N$ -point best-packing configurations in  $A$  is quasi-uniform on  $A$  (e.g., if  $A$  is the classical  $(1/3)$ -Cantor set in  $[0,1]$  together with any point outside this interval). However, for  $A$  as in Theorem 5, it turns out that by using  $(s, 1)$ -energy minimizing configurations on  $A$  and taking  $s \rightarrow \infty$  we can construct a sequence of  $N$ -point best-packing configurations in  $A$  that is also quasi-uniform on  $A$ .

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $A$  be a compact,  $\alpha$ -regular metric space with respect to the measure  $\mu$  and let  $K \subset A$  be a compact set of positive  $\mu$ -measure. For  $N \geq 2$ , let  $\nu_N$  be a cluster point of a family of  $N$ -point  $(s, 1)$ -energy minimizing configurations on  $K$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $\{\nu_N\}_{N=2}^\infty$  is a sequence of  $N$ -point best-packing configurations on  $K$  that is also quasi-uniform on  $K$ .*

*Furthermore, the mesh-separation ratios satisfy*

$$(2.12) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(\nu_N, K) \leq 2 \left( \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu(K)} \right)^{1/\alpha} [c_0(0) C_0(0)]^{1/\alpha},$$

where  $c_0(0)$  and  $C_0(0)$  are given in (1.8) for the set  $A$ .\*

We note that the constant on the right-hand side of (2.12) is at least 2 per (1.7) and (1.8). One can also establish an analogous result concerning the existence of quasi-uniform sequences of *weighted* best-packing configurations (cf. [3]). We leave this extension to the reader.

In comparison with (2.12), we remark that one can construct examples of metric spaces  $A$  having  $n$ -point best-packing configurations with arbitrarily large mesh-separation ratio.

We conclude this section with further references to related results. Separation theorems for the case  $s \leq d = \dim_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$  have been established only for rather special sets and values of  $s$ . Dahlberg [5] proved that (unweighted) optimal  $((p-2), 1)$ -energy configurations  $\omega_N^*$  on  $A$  are *well-separated* (i.e., they satisfy  $\delta(\omega_N^*) \geq CN^{-1/d}$  for some positive constant  $C$ ) if  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  ( $p \geq 3$ ) is a smooth  $d = p-1$  dimensional closed surface in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  that separates  $\mathbb{R}^p$  into two components. For the critical value  $s = d$  and  $A$  a  $d$ -rectifiable subset of a smooth  $d$ -dimensional manifold in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ , it is shown in [2] that the following weaker separation result holds

$$(2.13) \quad \delta(\omega_N^*) \geq C(N \log N)^{-1/d},$$

for some positive constant  $C$ .

For the case that  $A = \mathbb{S}^d$ , the  $d$ -dimensional unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ , well-separation was proved in [14] for the range of values  $d-1 < s < d$  and further extended by Dragnev and Saff [8] to the range  $d-2 < s < d$  with explicit estimates for the

---

\**Added in proof:* In the manuscript [1], the first two authors together with A. Bondarenko have recently proved under more general conditions that the right-hand side of (2.12) can be replaced by 1.

separation constant  $C$ . Well-separation for  $s = d - 2$  and  $d \geq 3$  was established in [6].

Thus, for the important case of  $A = \mathbb{S}^2$  it is known that optimal  $s$ -energy configurations on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  are well-separated for all nonnegative values of  $s \neq 2$  (well-separatedness for  $s = 0$  was established in [18]; see also [7]); for the critical value  $s = 2$ , the only known separation results are of the weak form given in (2.13).

Much less is known with regard to covering (mesh norm) theorems in the case that  $s \leq d$  (see [20, Sec. 1.3]).

### 3. PROOFS

In the proofs we shall need that an SLP weight  $w$  is bounded below in a neighborhood of the diagonal  $D(A)$ . Indeed, the positivity and lower semi-continuity of  $w$  on  $D(A)$  and the compactness of  $A$  imply that there are positive numbers  $\eta$  and  $\kappa$  such that

$$(3.1) \quad w(x, y) \geq \eta \quad (x, y \in A, m(x, y) \leq \kappa).$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* The initial part of this argument proceeds as in [13]. Let  $N \geq 2$  be fixed and let  $\omega_N^* = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} \subset A$  be a fixed  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configuration in  $A$ . For  $x \in A$  and  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , let

$$U_i(x) := \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N \frac{w(x, x_j)}{(x, x_j)^s}.$$

Since  $\omega_N^*$  is a minimizing configuration we have the lower bound

$$(3.2) \quad U_i(x_i) \leq U_i(x) \text{ for all } x \in A.$$

Fix  $r_1 \leq \text{diam}(A)$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad \bar{\mu} \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^N B(x_j, r_1) \right) \geq \bar{\mu}(A).$$

The radius  $r_1$  can clearly be chosen independent of  $N$ , for example  $r_1 = \text{diam}(A)$ , and we note for future reference that it suffices to take  $r_1 > \rho(\omega_N^*, A)$ . For the rest of this proof we fix  $r_1 = \text{diam}(A)$ .

Now let  $0 < \theta < 1$  and define

$$(3.4) \quad r_0 := \left( \frac{\theta \bar{\mu}(A)}{N C_0(r_1)} \right)^{1/\alpha},$$

where  $C_0(r_1) = C_0$  is the upper regularity constant of  $\bar{\mu}$  as in (1.7). We note that  $r_0 < r_1$  as can be seen from the fact that  $\bar{\mu}(A) \leq C_0(r_1) r_1^\alpha$ .

For  $B(x, r_0, r_1) := B(x, r_1) \setminus B(x, r_0)$ , let

$$D := \bigcup_{j=1}^N B(x_j, r_0, r_1).$$



Using the upper regularity of  $\bar{\mu}$  and (3.3) we see that

$$\bar{\mu}(D) \geq \bar{\mu}(A) - \sum_{j=1}^N \bar{\mu}(B(x_j, r_0)) \geq (1 - \theta) \bar{\mu}(A) > 0,$$

and thus by inequality (3.2) we have

$$(3.5) \quad U_i(x_i) \leq \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}(D)} \int_D U_i(x) d\bar{\mu}(x) \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \theta) \bar{\mu}(A)} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N \int_{B(x_j, r_0, r_1)} \frac{w(x, x_j)}{(x, x_j)^s} d\bar{\mu}(x).$$

Applying Hölder's inequality with  $1/q = 1 - 1/p$  we obtain

$$(3.6) \quad U_i(x_i) \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \theta) \bar{\mu}(A)} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N \|w(\cdot, x_j)\|_{L_p(\bar{\mu})} \left( \int_{B(x_j, r_0, r_1)} \frac{1}{(x, x_j)^{sq}} d\bar{\mu}(x) \right)^{1/q}.$$

Converting the integral on the right-hand side of (3.6) to the appropriate integral of the distribution function, and noting that  $sq > \alpha$  by assumption, we have

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B(x_j, r_0, r_1)} \frac{1}{(x, x_j)^{sq}} d\bar{\mu}(x) &= \int_0^\infty \bar{\mu}(\{x \in B(x_j, r_0, r_1) : m(x_j, x)^{-sq} > t\}) dt \\ &\leq \int_{r_1^{-sq}}^{r_0^{-sq}} \bar{\mu}(B(x_j, t^{-1/sq})) dt \\ &\leq \frac{C_0(r_1) sq}{sq - \alpha} r_0^{\alpha - sq} \\ &= \frac{C_0(r_1) sq}{sq - \alpha} \left( \frac{\theta \bar{\mu}(A)}{N C_0(r_1)} \right)^{1 - (sq)/\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (3.6), gives

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} U_i(x_i) &\leq \frac{\|w\|_{p,\infty}}{(1 - \theta) \bar{\mu}(A)} \left( \frac{C_0(r_1) sq}{sq - \alpha} \right)^{1/q} (N - 1) \left( \frac{\theta \bar{\mu}(A)}{N C_0(r_1)} \right)^{1/q - s/\alpha} \\ &< \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}(A)} \left( \frac{C_0(r_1)}{\bar{\mu}(A)} \right)^{s/\alpha} \left( \frac{\|w\|_{p,\infty}}{(1 - \theta) \theta^{s/\alpha - 1/q}} \right) \left( \frac{sq \bar{\mu}(A)}{sq - \alpha} \right)^{1/q} N^{1/p + s/\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\|w\|_{p,\infty} := \sup_{x \in A} \|w(\cdot, x)\|_{L_p(\bar{\mu})} < \infty$ .

Choosing

$$(3.9) \quad \theta_0 := \frac{sq - \alpha}{sq - \alpha + \alpha q} = \left( \frac{s}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{q} \right) \left( \frac{s}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{p} \right)^{-1} < 1,$$

which minimizes the right-hand side of (3.8) with respect to  $\theta$ , we obtain

$$(3.10) \quad U_i(x_i) \leq c_1 N^{s/\alpha + 1/p},$$

where after a bit of arithmetic we have

$$(3.11) \quad c_1 := \|w\|_{p,\infty} \left( \frac{C_0(r_1)}{\bar{\mu}(A)} \frac{s/\alpha + 1/p}{s/\alpha - 1/q} \right)^{s/\alpha} \left( \frac{s/\alpha + 1/p}{\bar{\mu}(A)} \right)^{1/p} (s/\alpha)^{1/q}.$$

Next, select the indices  $1 \leq i_s \neq j_s \leq N$  so that  $\delta(\omega_N^*) = (x_{i_s}, x_{j_s})$  and let  $\kappa$  and  $\eta$  be as in (3.1). If  $\delta(\omega_N^*) \leq \kappa$ , then

$$(3.12) \quad \frac{\eta}{\delta(\omega_N^*)^s} \leq \frac{w(x_{i_s}, x_{j_s})}{(x_{i_s}, x_{j_s})^s} \leq U_{i_s}(x_{i_s}) \leq c_1 N^{s/\alpha+1/p},$$

and therefore

$$\delta(\omega_N^*) \geq \left( \frac{\eta}{c_1} \right)^{1/s} N^{-\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{sp}}.$$

Hence, (2.1) holds with

$$(3.13) \quad C_1 := \min\{\kappa, (\eta/c_1)^{1/s}\}.$$

□

We remark that for the case when  $w \equiv 1$  and  $p = \infty$ , we can take  $\kappa = \infty$ ,  $\eta = 1$ , and so from (3.13) we deduce the separation estimate

$$\delta(\omega_N^*) \geq C_2 N^{-1/\alpha} \quad (N \geq 2),$$

where

$$(3.14) \quad C_2 := \left[ \frac{\bar{\mu}(A)}{C_0(r_1)} (1 - \alpha/s) \right]^{1/\alpha} (\alpha/s)^{1/s}, \quad r_1 = \text{diam}(A).$$

For the proof of Theorem 3, we utilize the following.

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $A$  be a compact, infinite, lower  $\alpha$ -regular metric space with lower  $\alpha$ -regular measure  $\underline{\mu}$ ,  $w : A \times A \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be an SLP weight on  $A$ , and  $s > \alpha$ . Then there exists a positive integer  $N_0$  independent of  $s$ , such that*

$$(3.15) \quad \mathcal{E}_s^w(N, A) \geq C_5 N^{1+s/\alpha} \quad (N \geq N_0),$$

where  $C_5$  is a constant independent of  $N$  given below in (3.19).

*Proof.* Let  $\kappa$  and  $\eta$  be as in (3.1) and let  $0 < r_2 \leq \kappa$ . Since  $A$  is compact, there is some  $M$  such that the  $M$ -point best-packing distance satisfies

$$(3.16) \quad \delta_M(A) \leq r_2.$$

Let  $N > M$  and let  $\omega_N = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} \subset A$  be an arbitrary  $N$ -point configuration of distinct points. For  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , let  $y_i \in \omega_N$  be a fixed nearest neighbor to  $x_i$  in the configuration  $\omega_N$ , and set

$$\delta_i := (x_i, y_i) = \min_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq N \\ j \neq i}} (x_i, x_j) > 0.$$

We assume an ordering on  $\omega_N$  so that  $\delta_i \leq \delta_{i+1}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N-1$ . We note that  $\omega_N \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_{N-M}\}$  is of cardinality  $M$  and thus for all  $i \leq N' := N - M$  we have that  $\delta_i \leq r_2 \leq \kappa$ .

The energy of  $\omega_N$  then has the lower bound

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} E_s^w(\omega_N) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{N'} \frac{w(x_i, y_i)}{\delta_i^s} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{N'} \eta \left( \frac{1}{\delta_i^\alpha} \right)^{s/\alpha} \geq \eta \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N'} \frac{1}{\delta_i^\alpha} \right)^{s/\alpha} (N')^{1-s/\alpha} \\ &\geq \eta \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N'} \delta_i^\alpha \right)^{-s/\alpha} (N')^{1+s/\alpha} = \eta 2^{-s} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N'} \left( \frac{\delta_i}{2} \right)^\alpha \right)^{-s/\alpha} (N')^{1+s/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality in the first line follows from Jensen's inequality and the subsequent inequality follows from the harmonic-arithmetic mean inequality.

Let  $\Lambda > 1$  and  $N_0 := M\Lambda/(\Lambda - 1)$ . Then  $N' = N - M \geq \Lambda^{-1}N$  for  $N \geq N_0$ . Noting that the balls  $B(x_i, \delta_i/2)$  are pairwise disjoint, we may apply the lower regularity of  $\underline{\mu}$  (with regularity constant  $c_0(r_2)$ ) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_s^w(\omega_N) &\geq \eta 2^{-s} \left( c_0(r_2) \sum_{i=1}^{N'} \underline{\mu} \left( B(x_i, \frac{\delta_i}{2}) \right) \right)^{-s/\alpha} (N')^{1+s/\alpha} \\
 (3.18) \quad &\geq \frac{\eta}{(2^\alpha c_0(r_2) \underline{\mu}(A))^{s/\alpha}} (N')^{1+s/\alpha} \\
 &\geq \Lambda^{-1-s/\alpha} \frac{\eta}{(2^\alpha c_0(r_2) \underline{\mu}(A))^{s/\alpha}} N^{1+s/\alpha}
 \end{aligned}$$

Since (3.18) holds for arbitrary  $N$ -point configurations  $\omega_N \subset A$  with  $N \geq N_0$ , we obtain that (3.15) holds with

$$(3.19) \quad C_5 := \Lambda^{-1-s/\alpha} \eta 2^{-s} (c_0(r_2) \underline{\mu}(A))^{-s/\alpha}.$$

We remark that  $N_0$  depends on  $\Lambda$  and  $r_2$ , but is independent of  $s$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Appealing to the generality provided by Theorem 1 and Lemma 8, we can substantially extend and improve upon the arguments used in the proof of Theorem 3.6 in [6].

Let  $\omega_N^* = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  be an  $N$ -point  $(s, w)$ -energy minimizing configuration for the compact set  $K$ , and, for  $y \in K$ , consider the function

$$(3.20) \quad U(y) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{w(y, x_i)}{(y, x_i)^s}.$$

For fixed  $1 \leq j \leq N$ , the function  $U(y)$  can be decomposed as

$$(3.21) \quad U(y) = \frac{1}{N} \frac{w(y, x_j)}{(y, x_j)^s} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N \frac{w(y, x_i)}{(y, x_i)^s},$$

and, since  $\omega_N^*$  is a minimizing configuration on  $K$ , the point  $x_j$  minimizes the sum over  $i \neq j$  on the right-hand side of equation (3.21). Thus for each fixed  $j$  and  $y \in K$

$$(3.22) \quad U(y) \geq \frac{1}{N} \frac{w(y, x_j)}{(y, x_j)^s} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N \frac{w(x_j, x_i)}{m(x_j, x_i)^s}.$$

Summing over  $j$  gives

$$(3.23) \quad NU(y) \geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{w(y, x_j)}{(y, x_j)^s} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N \frac{w(x_j, x_i)}{m(x_j, x_i)^s}$$

$$(3.24) \quad = U(y) + \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{E}_s^w(N, K),$$

and thus

$$(3.25) \quad U(y) \geq \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \mathcal{E}_s^w(N, K) \geq \frac{\mathcal{E}_s^w(N, K)}{N^2} \quad (y \in K).$$

Since  $K$  is compact, there exists a point  $y^* \in K$  such that

$$(3.26) \quad \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} (y^*, x_i) = \rho(\omega_N^*, K) =: \rho(\omega_N^*).$$

Using the fact that a function is lower semi-continuous if and only if it is the limit of an increasing sequence of continuous functions, it is not difficult to show that since  $w$  is a bounded SLP weight on  $K$ , it may be extended to a bounded SLP weight on  $A$ . Then, by Lemma 8, there are constants  $N_0$  and  $C_5 > 0$  such that

$$(3.27) \quad \mathcal{E}_s^w(N, K) \geq \mathcal{E}_s^w(N, A) \geq C_5 N^{1+s/\alpha} \quad (N \geq N_0).$$

We note that the constant  $C_5$  of (3.27) does not depend on  $K$ , but rather on  $A$  (specifically on the lower regularity constant of  $A$  and on  $\mu(A)$ ) as well as on the extended weight  $w$ .

Since (3.25) holds for the point  $y^*$  of (3.26), we combine (3.25) with (3.27) to obtain

$$(3.28) \quad U(y^*) \geq \frac{\mathcal{E}_s^w(N, K)}{N^2} \geq C_5 N^{s/\alpha-1} \quad (N \geq N_0).$$

Next we determine an upper bound for  $U(y^*)$  using the  $\alpha$ -regularity of the superset  $A$ . Since  $A$  is upper  $\alpha$ -regular, we see that  $K$  is also because  $\mu(K) > 0$ . Hence, Corollary 2 applied to  $K$  implies that there is some  $C_2 > 0$  such that  $\delta(\omega_N^*) \geq C_2 N^{-1/\alpha}$  for  $N \geq 2$ . We note that the constant  $C_2$  here depends on  $K$ , specifically  $\mu(K)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{N}$  consist of those  $N \geq N_0$  such that

$$(3.29) \quad \rho(\omega_N^*) \geq \frac{C_2}{2} N^{-1/\alpha}.$$

If  $\mathcal{N}$  is empty (or finite) then we are done. Assuming that  $\mathcal{N}$  is nonempty, let  $N \in \mathcal{N}$  be fixed.

For  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ , let

$$(3.30) \quad r_0 = r_0(N, \epsilon) := \epsilon C_2 N^{-1/\alpha}.$$

Note that any two of the balls  $B(x_i, r_0) \subset A$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , do not intersect since  $r_0 < \delta(\omega_N^*)/2$ .

For any  $x \in B(x_i, r_0)$ , inequalities (3.26) and (3.29) imply

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} (x, y^*) &\leq (x, x_i) + (x_i, y^*) \leq r_0 + (x_i, y^*) \\ &\leq 2\epsilon \rho(\omega_N^*) + (x_i, y^*) \leq (1 + 2\epsilon)(x_i, y^*). \end{aligned}$$

For fixed  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , using (3.31) and taking an average value on  $B(x_i, r_0)$  we obtain

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{w(x_i, y^*)}{(x_i, y^*)^s} &\leq \frac{\|w\|_\infty (1 + 2\epsilon)^s}{\mu(B(x_i, r_0))} \int_{B(x_i, r_0)} \frac{d\mu(x)}{(x, y^*)^s} \\ &\leq \frac{\|w\|_\infty (1 + 2\epsilon)^s c_0(r_0)}{r_0^\alpha} \int_{B(x_i, r_0)} \frac{d\mu(x)}{(x, y^*)^s}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\|w\|_\infty$  denotes the sup-norm of  $w$  on  $A \times A$  and  $c_0(r_0)$  is the localized constant of (1.7) for the set  $A$ .

Inequality (3.29) and definition (3.30) imply  $2\epsilon\rho(\omega_N^*) \geq r_0$  and thus, for  $x \in B(x_i, r_0)$ , we obtain

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} (x, y^*) &\geq (x_i, y^*) - (x, x_i) \geq (x_i, y^*) - r_0 \\ &\geq (x_i, y^*) - 2\epsilon\rho(\omega_N^*) \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)\rho(\omega_N^*). \end{aligned}$$

Inequality (3.33) implies

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^N B(x_i, r_0) \subset A \setminus B(y^*, (1 - 2\epsilon)\rho(\omega_N^*)),$$

and since the left-hand side is a disjoint union, averaging the inequalities of (3.32) we have

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} U(y^*) &\leq \frac{\|w\|_\infty (1 + 2\epsilon)^s c_0(r_0)}{N r_0^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{B(x_i, r_0)} \frac{d\mu(x)}{(x, y^*)^s} \\ &\leq \frac{\|w\|_\infty (1 + 2\epsilon)^s c_0(r_0)}{N r_0^\alpha} \int_{A \setminus B(y^*, (1-2\epsilon)\rho(\omega_N^*))} \frac{d\mu(x)}{(x, y^*)^s}. \end{aligned}$$

For fixed  $\tau \geq 1$  we define the radius  $R(N) := \tau(1 - 2\epsilon)\rho(\omega_N^*)$ , and the constant

$$(3.35) \quad \tilde{C}_0(\tau) := C_0(R(N))(1 - \tau^{\alpha-s}) + C_0\tau^{\alpha-s}.$$

Note that if  $\tau = 1$ , then  $\tilde{C}_0(1) = C_0$ . (We retain  $\tau$  as a parameter in our estimates as an option for the reader to optimize  $C_3$  for a fixed  $s$ .) Now we break the integral on the right-hand side of (3.34) into two terms and proceed as in (3.7) to obtain

$$(3.36) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{A \setminus B(y^*, (1-2\epsilon)\rho(\omega_N^*))} \frac{d\mu(x)}{(x, y^*)^s} \\ &= \int_{B(y^*, (1-2\epsilon)\rho(\omega_N^*), R(N))} \frac{d\mu(x)}{(x, y^*)^s} + \int_{A \setminus B(y^*, R(N))} \frac{d\mu(x)}{(x, y^*)^s} \\ &\leq C_0(R(N)) \int_{R(N)^{-s}}^{[(1-2\epsilon)\rho(\omega_N^*)]^{-s}} t^{-\alpha/s} dt + C_0 \int_0^{R(N)^{-s}} t^{-\alpha/s} dt \\ &= \frac{\tilde{C}_0(\tau)}{(1 - \alpha/s)(1 - 2\epsilon)^{s-\alpha}} \rho(\omega_N^*)^{\alpha-s}. \end{aligned}$$

It is convenient to define the quantity

$$(3.37) \quad \beta(\epsilon) := \frac{\|w\|_\infty (1 + 2\epsilon)^s}{(1 - \alpha/s)(1 - 2\epsilon)^{s-\alpha} (\epsilon C_2)^\alpha},$$

and we note that for fixed  $s > \alpha$  it is minimized as a function of  $\epsilon$  for

$$(3.38) \quad \epsilon_0 := \frac{1}{2(2(s/\alpha) - 1)} < \frac{1}{2},$$

with minimal value

$$(3.39) \quad \beta_0 := \beta(\epsilon_0) = \frac{\|w\|_\infty}{(1 - \alpha/s)^{s-\alpha+1}} \left( \frac{4s}{\alpha C_2} \right)^\alpha.$$

Using  $\epsilon_0$  and combining inequality (3.34) with inequality (3.36) we obtain

$$(3.40) \quad U(y^*) \leq c_0(r_0)\beta_0\tilde{C}_0(\tau)\rho(\omega_N^*)^{\alpha-s}.$$

If  $N \in \mathcal{N}$ , then (3.40) and (3.28) imply

$$\rho(\omega_N^*) \leq \left[ \frac{c_0(r_0)\beta_0\tilde{C}_0(\tau)}{C_5} \right]^{1/(s-\alpha)} N^{-1/\alpha}.$$

If  $N \notin \mathcal{N}$ , then either  $N \leq N_0$  or  $\rho(\omega_N^*) < \frac{C_2}{2}N^{-1/\alpha}$ . Hence (2.9) holds with

$$(3.41) \quad C_3 := \max \left\{ \text{diam}(A)N_0^{1/\alpha}, \left[ \frac{c_0(r_0)\beta_0\tilde{C}_0(\tau)}{C_5} \right]^{1/(s-\alpha)}, \frac{C_2}{2} \right\}.$$

We note that if  $N > N_0$ , then it suffices to take

$$(3.42) \quad C_3 = \max \left\{ \left[ \frac{c_0(r_0)\beta_0\tilde{C}_0(\tau)}{C_5} \right]^{1/(s-\alpha)}, \frac{C_2}{2} \right\}$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 7.* Starting with Theorem 3 we shall employ a bootstrapping argument whereby the constants  $C_2$ ,  $C_5$ , and subsequently  $C_3$  are redefined so as to depend on  $N$ .

We begin by noting that if  $s \geq 2\alpha$ , then the constant  $C_3$  of (3.41) has a uniform upper bound in  $s$ ; indeed, with  $\kappa = \infty$ ,  $C_2$  as defined in (3.14) and  $C_5$  as defined in (3.19) (with  $\eta = 1$ ), each of the three terms appearing in braces in (3.41) is uniformly bounded above. Thus there exists a constant  $C^*$  independent of  $N \geq 2$  and of  $s \geq 2\alpha$  such that  $\rho(\omega_N^{(s)}, K) < C^*N^{-1/\alpha}$ , where  $\omega_N^{(s)}$  is any  $N$ -point  $(s, 1)$ -energy minimizing configuration on  $K$ .

We next note that  $C_0(0)$  of (1.8) is finite and positive, and utilizing the constant  $c_A$  of (1.9) we fix

$$(3.43) \quad C^{**} := \max \left\{ C^*, c_A, \left( \frac{\mu(K)}{C_0(0)} \right)^{1/\alpha} \right\},$$

and we now redefine the radius  $r_1$  to be a function of  $N$ ,

$$(3.44) \quad r_1(N) := C^{**} N^{-1/\alpha} \quad (N \geq 2).$$

Returning to the proof of Theorem 1, we note that  $r_1(N) > \rho(\omega_N^{(s)}, K)$ , and so inequality (3.3) holds. Furthermore, by the choice of  $C^{**}$  we have that for  $0 < \theta_0 < 1$  as in (3.9)

$$r_0(N) := \left( \frac{\theta_0 \mu(K)}{N C_0(0)} \right)^{1/\alpha} < r_1(N).$$

Taking  $r_0 = r_0(N)$  in the proof and remembering that  $q = 1$  in the current context, we see that with  $A$  replaced by  $K$  the penultimate term on right-hand side of (3.7) becomes

$$\frac{s C_0(r_1(N))}{s - \alpha} \left( \frac{\theta_0 \mu(K)}{N C_0(0)} \right)^{1-s/\alpha},$$

and thus

$$(3.45) \quad \int_{B(x_j, r_0(N), r_1(N))} \frac{d\mu(x)}{(x, x_j)^s} \leq \frac{sC_0(r_1(N))}{s-\alpha} \left( \frac{\theta_0 \mu(K)}{N C_0(0)} \right)^{1-s/\alpha} \\ \leq \frac{s}{s-\alpha} \left( \frac{\theta_0 \mu(K)}{N} \right)^{1-s/\alpha} C_0(r_1(N))^{s/\alpha},$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that  $C_0(0) \leq C_0(r_1(N))$  and  $s > \alpha$ .

For  $w \equiv 1$ , the constant  $C_2$  of (3.14) with  $r_1 = r_1(N)$  becomes

$$(3.46) \quad C_2(N) := \left( \frac{\alpha}{s} \right)^{1/s} \left( \frac{1 - \alpha/s}{C_0(r_1(N))} \right)^{1/\alpha} \mu(K)^{1/\alpha},$$

where  $C_0(r_1(N))$  is the local upper regularity constant of (1.7), and we have

$$\delta(\omega_N^{(s)}) \geq C_2(N) N^{-1/\alpha} \quad (N \geq 2, s \geq 2\alpha).$$

Furthermore, allowing the radius  $r_2$  appearing in (3.16) to depend on  $N \geq 2$  by taking  $r_2 := r_1(N)$ , we see via (1.9) and (3.43) that

$$r_1(N) \geq \delta_N(A) \quad (N \geq 2),$$

and there is no need to designate the integer  $M$  in the proof of Lemma 8. Thus we can take  $\Lambda = 1$  in (3.19), and it follows (with  $\eta = 1$ ) that

$$E_s^1(\omega_N^{(s)}) \geq C_5(N) N^{1+s/\alpha} \quad (N \geq 2, s \geq 2\alpha),$$

where

$$(3.47) \quad C_5(N) := \frac{1}{2^s [c_0(r_1(N)) \mu(A)]^{s/\alpha}}.$$

We remark that  $C_2(N)$  clearly depends on the subset  $K$ , whereas  $C_5(N)$  depends on the superset  $A$ .

We now return to the proof of Theorem 3 utilizing the constants  $C_2(N)$  and  $C_5(N)$ . For  $\beta_0$  as in (3.39), we see that

$$\rho(\omega_N^{(s)}, K) \leq C_3(N) N^{-1/\alpha} \quad (N \geq N_0, s \geq 2\alpha),$$

where  $N_0$  is as in Lemma 8, and by (3.42) (choosing  $\tau = 1$ , so that  $\tilde{C}_0(\tau) = C_0$ )

$$(3.48) \quad C_3(N) := \max \left\{ \left[ \frac{c_0(r_0) \beta_0 C_0}{C_5(N)} \right]^{1/(s-\alpha)}, \frac{C_2(N)}{2} \right\}.$$

With equations (3.46)-(3.48) in mind, we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 7. The argument leading to equation (2.11) shows that  $\nu_N$  is an  $N$ -point best-packing configuration on  $K$  for each  $N \geq 2$ . We now need to determine the limits of the constants  $C_2(N)$  of (3.46) and  $C_3(N)$  of (3.48) as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . Fixing  $N$  in (3.46) yields

$$(3.49) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} C_2(N) = \left( \frac{\mu(K)}{C_0(r_1(N))} \right)^{1/\alpha} =: \hat{C}_2(N).$$

Since  $c_0(r_0)$  and  $C_0$  are independent of  $s$  and  $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \beta_0^{1/(s-\alpha)} = 1$ , it follows, that for fixed  $N$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} C_3(N) &= \max \left\{ \frac{\hat{C}_2(N)}{2}, \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} C_5(N)^{1/(\alpha-s)} \right\} \\
 (3.50) \quad &= \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\mu(K)}{C_0(r_1(N))} \right)^{1/\alpha}, 2[c_0(r_1(N))\mu(A)]^{1/\alpha} \right\} \\
 &:= \hat{C}_3(N)
 \end{aligned}$$

From the continuity of  $\delta(\cdot)$  and  $\rho(\cdot, K)$  on  $K^N$  we deduce that

$$\delta(\nu_N) \geq \hat{C}_2(N)N^{-1/\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(\nu_N, K) \leq \hat{C}_3(N)N^{-1/\alpha} \quad (N \geq N_0).$$

Taking the ratio of these two quantities we have that

$$(3.51) \quad \frac{\rho(\nu_N, K)}{\delta(\nu_N)} \leq \frac{\hat{C}_3(N)}{\hat{C}_2(N)} = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, 2 \left( \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu(K)} \right)^{1/\alpha} [c_0(r_1(N)) C_0(r_1(N))]^{1/\alpha} \right\},$$

and hence for  $N \geq N_0$

$$(3.52) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho(\nu_N, K)}{\delta(\nu_N)} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, 2 \left( \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu(K)} \right)^{1/\alpha} [c_0(0) C_0(0)]^{1/\alpha} \right\}$$

$$(3.53) \quad = 2 \left( \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu(K)} \right)^{1/\alpha} [c_0(0) C_0(0)]^{1/\alpha} < \infty.$$

Therefore, the sequence of configurations  $\{\nu_N\}_{N=2}^\infty$  is quasi-uniform on  $K$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** We thank the referees for their careful reading and detailed comments.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A.V. Bondarenko, D.P. Hardin, E.B. Saff, *Mesh norms and separation distances for best-packing configurations*, (manuscript).
- [2] S.V. Borodachov, D.P. Hardin, E.B. Saff, *Asymptotics for discrete weighted minimal Riesz energy problems on rectifiable sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **360** (2008), 1559–1580.
- [3] S.V. Borodachov, E.B. Saff, D.P. Hardin, *Asymptotics of densest weighted packing on rectifiable sets* (Russian) Mat. Sb. **199** (2008), 3–20; translation in Sb. Math. **199** (2008), 1579–1595.
- [4] J.S. Brauchart, D.P. Hardin, E.B. Saff, *The support of the limit distribution of optimal Riesz energy points on sets of revolution in  $\mathbb{R}^3$* , J. Math. Phys. **48** (2007), 122901, 24 pp.
- [5] B.E.J. Dahlberg, *On the distribution of Fekete points*, Duke Math. J. **45** (1978), 537–542.
- [6] S.B. Damelin, V. Maymeskul, *On point energies, separation radius, and mesh norm for  $s$ -extremal configurations on compact sets in  $\mathbb{R}^n$* , J. Complexity **21** (2005), 845–863.
- [7] P.D. Dragnev, *On the separation of logarithmic points on the sphere*, Approximation Theory X: Abstract and Classical Analysis (C. K. Chui, L. L. Schumaker, and J. Stöckler, eds.) (2002) 137–144.
- [8] P.D. Dragnev, E.B. Saff, *Riesz spherical potentials with external fields and minimal energy points separation*, Potential Anal. **26** (2007), 139–162.
- [9] E.J. Fuselier, G.B. Wright, *Stability and error estimates for vector field interpolation and decomposition on the sphere with RBFs*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **47** (2009), 3213–3239.
- [10] D.P. Hardin, E.B. Saff, *Minimal Riesz energy point configurations for rectifiable  $d$ -dimensional manifolds*, Adv. Math. **193** (2005), 174–204.
- [11] D.P. Hardin, E.B. Saff, H. Stahl, *Support of the logarithmic equilibrium measure on sets of revolution in  $\mathbb{R}^3$* , J. Math. Phys. **48** (2007), 022901, 14 pp.



- [12] J. Heinonen, *Lectures on Analysis on Metric Spaces*, Springer-Verlag New York, Universitext (2001)
- [13] A.B.J. Kuijlaars, E.B. Saff, *Asymptotics for minimal discrete energy on the sphere*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **350** (1998), 523-538.
- [14] A.B.J. Kuijlaars, E.B. Saff, X. Sun, *On a separation of minimal Riesz energy points on spheres in Euclidean spaces*, J. Comp. Appl. Math. **199**: (2007) 172-180.
- [15] Q.T. Le Gia, I.H. Sloan, H. Wendland, *Multiscale analysis in Sobolev spaces on the sphere*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 48 (2010), 20652090. 65J10 (46E35 46N40)
- [16] P. Mattila, *Geometry of Sets and Measures in Euclidean Spaces; fractals and rectifiability*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Math. vol. **44**, Cambridge University Press (1995).
- [17] I. Pesenson, *A sampling theorem on homogeneous manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **352** (2000), 4257-4269.
- [18] E.A. Rakhmanov, E.B. Saff, Y.M. Zhou, *Electrons on the sphere*. Comput. Methods Funct. Theory, 293-309, Ser. Approx. Decompos., 5, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1995. 78A30 .
- [19] R. Schaback, *Error estimates and condition numbers for radial basis function interpolation*, Adv. Comput. Math. **3** (1995), 251-264.
- [20] A. Schürmann, *Computational Geometry of Positive Definite Quadratic Forms*, University Lecture Series vol. 48, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2009).
- [21] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal Polynomials*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. Publ. **23**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 4th edition (1975).

D. P. HARDIN, E. B. SAFF, AND J. T. WHITEHOUSE: CENTER FOR CONSTRUCTIVE APPROXIMATION, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TN 37240, USA

*E-mail address:* Doug.Hardin@Vanderbilt.Edu

*E-mail address:* Edward.B.Saff@Vanderbilt.Edu

*E-mail address:* Tyler.Whitehouse@gmail.com